

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added or canceled.

Title

The title has been amended to cure minor informalities.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and safe receipt of the priority document.

35 U.S.C. §112

With respect to claim 8, Applicants wish to point out to the Examiner that the "transfer number designation register" is a part of the "data transfer controller". The Examiner's attention is directed to Fig. 2 and its corresponding description, by way of example. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mitsuhira et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,325,489). Claims 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhiro et al ('489). These rejections are traversed as follows.

As recognized by the Examiner, according to the present invention, a data transfer controller issues an interrupt to an external (e.g., CPU) from a control unit (e.g., DMA controller) upon completion of transfer of a predetermined data amount. For example, claim 1 specifically recites that "said control unit issues an interrupt each time a data transfer corresponding to the external request reaches a predetermined data amount based upon the transfer source address".

On the other hand, Mitsuhiro et al clearly discloses that a DMA controller accepts an interrupt (transfer request) from the external of the DMA controller and subsequently performs an operation. This is clearly different from the claimed invention. Applicants claimed interrupt is for the external (CPU), while Mitsuhiro et al's interrupt is for the transfer control unit (DMA controller). Therefore, the Examiner has clearly misunderstood the teaching of Mitsuhiro et al.

Applicants' transfer controller allows transfer operations to continue without issuing an interrupt from the external. Since the Examiner has misunderstood the teaching of Mitsuhiro et al, the Examiner is kindly requested to

Appl. No. 09/873,242
Amdt of November 2, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2004

ASA-1008

withdraw the finality of the Office Action in order to properly consider this cited reference. In addition, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone with any questions.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR

By


Shrinath Malur

Reg. No. 34,663

Tel.: 703-684-1120